DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 163 SP 012 789

AUTHOR Nutting, William C.
TITLE Capacity for Quality Teacher Education Programs: Guidelines for Limiting Enrollments.
PUB DATE 2 Feb 78
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, Association of Teacher Educators (58th, Las Vegas, Nevada, February 1-3, 1978); For related documents, see SP 012 790

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Admission Criteria; *College Admission; *Educational Quality; Facility Requirements; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; *Preservice Education; Quality Control; Student Teacher Ratio
IDENTIFIERS *Enrollment Ceilings; *University of Utah

ABSTRACT

Rationale and guidelines for limiting enrollments in the teacher education program of the University of Utah are developed and presented. The need for such guidelines had arisen due to a State Board of Regents demand that maximum quotas for admission to teacher education programs, based upon projected job market needs, be established. While finding this fiat unacceptable, the University Council for Teacher Education saw the opportunity to implement a policy which, while meeting the letter of state requirements, was based on the capacity of the various University departments to provide "in a quality fashion" the facilities, services, and instructions for students preparing for teaching. It was held that the only legitimate grounds for restricting or limiting the numbers of students were satisfaction of the minimum requirements for admission, retention, and graduation and capacity of the departments to provide quality services. The rationale and guidelines are presented in discussions centering on six questions: (1) What minimum requirements should be established for admission, retention, and graduation? (2) What, in the opinion of faculty, are the significant characteristics of quality teacher education? (3) What are the University limitations as a whole in terms of providing adequately for the candidate's general education and well-being as a student? (4) What numerical restrictions on candidates might be placed by each of the academic departments participating in the teacher education enterprise? (5) What restrictions or limitations might be proposed by participating school districts? and (6) What is the overall capacity of the Department of Education in relation to each of the teacher education programs? (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155163

CAPACITY FOR QUALITY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: GUIDELINES FOR LIMITING ENROLLMENTS[1]

William C. Nutting
University of Utah

Credibility in teacher education may be either enhanced or jeopardized by practices which regulate the numbers of candidates who are admitted to and retained in teacher education programs. If high quality programs are to be developed and maintained, student capacities in those programs must surely be regarded as finite, and the matter of arriving at workable formulas for limiting enrollments warrants serious consideration. The conclusions of a fairly typical teacher education department in a state university which deliberately posed for itself the student capacity question may be helpful to persons who also may have occasion to ponder the options.

The Department of Education of the University of Utah has published a detailed report of a self-appraisal study that was carried out over a four-year period.[2] One of the

---

[1]Adapted from portions of William C. Nutting (ed.), A Faculty Self-Appraisal of the Department of Education of the University of Utah (Salt Lake City: Department of Education, University of Utah, 1976). Used with permission.

[2]Ibid.

SP012 789

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY William C. Nutting TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

important aspects of that work was an attempt to provide a rationale and basic guidelines for limiting enrollments in its teacher education programs.

The study was undertaken not only for departmentally-oriented reasons, but also with respect to certain extra-departmental conditions, the most immediate of which developed from the responses of the University of Utah Senate and the University Council for Teacher Education to an arbitrary and unprecedented fiat of the Utah State Board of Regents. The higher education board, having become aware during the early seventies of a dramatic leveling off in the placement of new teachers in the public schools of the state, and possibly sensing some political benefit in a token display of economy, acted abruptly and unilaterally. Without consulting other concerned agencies, the regents decreed that all state-controlled universities and colleges promptly establish maximum quotas for admission to teacher education programs based upon the projected job market for new teachers in the state.

Although not at all pleased with either the rationale or the arbitrary procedure of the Regents, the University Senate nevertheless sought to comply at least with the letter--if not entirely the spirit--of the edict. The University council on Teacher Education was relatively less tractable. However, despite its resolve not to become a party to any precedent for linking university admissions

to labor market fluctuations (which was perceived as philosophically repugnant), the Council recognized in the situation an opportunity to implement a policy of limiting student admissions to teacher education programs--not in terms of position openings for new teachers in the public schools, but rather according to the capacities of various departments on the campus to provide "in a quality fashion" the facilities, services and instruction for students preparing for teaching. Thus, while "quota," with its arbitrary job-market-related connotation, was frequently regarded as a dirty word, the notion of "capacity for quality teacher education" was rather widely accepted as a legitimate and reasonable limiting of student enrollment to numbers that might be served with excellence.

It was precisely in this spirit that the Department of Education undertook to determine whether and how maximum student capacities ought to be established. An ad hoc faculty committee was delegated to conduct the investigation. The study was concluded some four years later with the publication of the aforementioned report, which presented a statement of identified aims and function of the department, a rationale and recommended guidelines for determining student capacities, and a proposal for a comprehensive plan of evaluation.

During the course of its self-appraisal, the department reaffirmed a long-held conviction that the only justifiable

grounds for restricting or limiting the numbers of students who may be admitted to and retained in teacher education programs are (1) whether a particular candidate can satisfy the established minimum requirements for admission, retention, and--ultimately--graduation, and (2) whether each of the various departments and agencies that will be called upon to serve the student has the overall capacity to provide quality programs in terms of instruction, guidance, and essential services.

Taking this as a basic assumption, there are six major questions to be considered in the whole matter of determining optimum student capacities in the department:

1. What are the minimum requirements that ought to be established for admission, retention, and graduation with respect to each of the programs in teacher education that are offered by the Department of Education?
2. What, in the judgment of the department faculty, are the significant characteristics of quality teacher education pertinent to each of the programs?
3. What are the limitations of the University of Utah as a whole in terms of providing adequately for the candidate's general education and well-being as a student?

4. What restrictions as to numbers of candidates in each of the programs in teacher education are likely to be imposed by each of the academic departments and other agencies that participate in the total teacher education enterprise of the university?
5. What are the restrictions or limitations that may be imposed by the several school districts that cooperate in the various teacher education programs of the department?
6. What is the overall capacity of the Department of Education in relation to each of the teacher education programs?

The report discussed each of the relevant considerations.

Recommended Requirements for Admission, Retention, and Graduation

Whenever a candidate is admitted to one of the teacher education programs of the department, there is implicitly the hope and reasonable expectation that he or she will be able to complete the program satisfactorily through to graduation and certification as a teacher. While the matter of graduation is totally within the purview of the university, the granting of teacher certificates is a prerogative that has been vested with the State Board of Education. Within

recent years, it has been the practice of that agency to grant an individual teacher's certificate upon the recommendation of the university or college in which the candidate completed his or her professional preparation. In order to satisfy its own accountability as to professional licensing practices, the board arranges periodically to review the ongoing programs of the various teacher-preparing institutions with which it maintains active relationships. Two points that ought to be recognized are (1) that distinctive purposes and conditions obtain between the requirements for graduation from the university and the requirements for certification as a teacher, and (2) that policies of admission and retention of candidates in teacher education programs must necessarily mesh with the letter and intent of both sets of requirements.

For approximately the past three decades, matters of admission and retention at the University of Utah have been systematically regulated by deliberate policy. Applicants seeking admission to teacher education programs are required to furnish evidence as to qualification in terms of general health, basic scholarship, and potential for professional growth. Retention in the programs is not automatically assured, but rather is contingent upon the candidate's maintaining an appropriate level of achievement and expectation.

While current policies covering admission and retention of candidates are not regarded as entirely adequate,

there is no sentiment for either abolishing or weakening existing policies. On the contrary, there is substantial demand that criteria be even more selective.

The department places a high priority upon its role in improving the quality of teaching in the public schools. Personal and academic prerequisities for a professional curriculum that will contribute significantly toward such an achievement call for teacher education candidates of high caliber. A straightforward policy of deliberate selectivity is, therefore, needed.

Selectivity based upon certain personal qualities is obviously an important aspect of the recommendation. The department holds that there are identifiable human values and attitudes that must be developed in children and youth, and that these values and attitudes may best be developed by teachers whose own lives have somehow been correspondingly enriched. Although much may be accomplished through careful designing and implementing of professional curriculum, the opportunity may be greatly enhanced by purposefully seeking out for admission those candidates with the greatest potential for growth along these lines. The following personal qualities are particularly desirable.

1. Positive self-image.
2. Genuine caring for people in general and children in particular.

3. Uniqueness.
4. Self-actuating.
5. Enthusiasm for study.
6. Functional sociability.
7. Flexibility and adaptability.
8. Dedication to the teaching profession.
9. Belief in the power of teaching.

Concern for the cognitive aspects of teaching-learning relationships points up another possible advantage of an assertive policy of active recruitment. Since a major portion of the school's daily business is dealing systematically in knowledge, the need for teachers who can communicate knowledge effectively to children and youth should be recognized. Admissions criteria, therefore, ought to serve to attract candidates who are especially well qualified with respect to three additional considerations.

1. Facility in communication skills.
2. Familiarity with pertinent fields of formalized knowledge.
3. Potential for continued mastery of knowledge areas that the candidate will be expected to teach.

Characteristics of Quality Teacher Education

Providing teacher education of high quality has long been a matter of concern in the Department of Education.

But for more than twenty years a hard-working faculty scrambled to do what had to be done in terms of preparing enough candidates to supply a constantly expanding job market as a postwar baby boom tidal-waved through the public schools. Not until recently, however--not until the population explosion had peaked and the supply and demand equation in teaching positions had leveled out--had there been any suggestion that limiting the numbers of candidates might be an acceptable option in striving for excellence in teacher education programs. The notion of actually placing restrictions on enrollments as a legitimate safety valve in assuring quality curriculum and instruction is a radical point of view in the Department of Education. But it is an idea that has come of age. The department is finally convinced that it not only has a right, but even a professional obligation, to hold admissions to numbers that are commensurate with the maintaining of excellence in programs.

The report reflects much concern for quality in teacher education. And, in several instances, that concern is focused upon the degree to which the quality of programs may be affected according to the numbers of candidates pursuing such programs.

Developing teachers who will function effectively in the elementary and secondary schools is, of course, a major purpose of the department. To a great extent, such on-the-job

effectiveness is assured through professional education experiences that have been designed to accommodate to individual differences and to enhance uniqueness in professional growth. Favorable student-faculty ratios are essential to the success of any program that is deliberately tailored to the peculiar needs of the individual candidate. Whenever a student-faculty ratio is allowed to become significantly out of balance, the relationship is inevitably altered and the nature of the program is commensurately changed.

The teacher education programs to which the Department of Education subscribes require breathing space. Candidates are encouraged to seek, to pursue, and to enjoy learning for its own sake. They are expected to experiment and to explore. They are to consider a variety of approaches, to enjoy processes of teaching and learning, to evaluate various models of good teaching, and to be critically selective. These are characteristics of teacher education programs that must not be overcrowded if the essential level of individual freedom is to be sustained.

The department is committed to helping teacher education candidates develop positive self-images. To this end, it is important that the candidate have opportunity to relate on a person-to-person basis with individual members of the faculty. Also, candidates are expected to share ideas, to

function as members of teams and groups, and to develop the quality of caring.

The department has a strong conviction that teacher education curriculum ought to include a significant proportion of clinical experiences for the preservice candidate. This, of course, has implications as to the numbers of candidates who may be accommodated.

The department seeks to foster career orientation on the part of its candidates through encouraging them to develop their own professional goals. Candidates need to develop a genuine dedication to the teaching profession. Above all, they must believe that what they teach is going to make a real difference in their students. These, again, are objectives that are best achieved under conditions that are uncrowded and unhurried.

The department wants to deliver high quality teacher education. The worth of its programs must not be jeopardized through forced accommodation to unrestricted numbers of candidates. Whenever quality and unlimited enrollments come into conflict, quality must be maintained. In such instances, admissions must be restricted.

Limitations of the University in General

The question as to possible limitations of the university as a whole in terms of providing adequately for the candidate's general education and well-being as a student may appear more theoretical than practical. There is some

tendency to take for granted that the university is "there" to continue indefinitely in much the same role that it has played for the past fifty or one hundred years. In any event, it may seem that little can be done by way of incorporating its variegated confluences into a scheme for setting optimum student capacities in teacher education programs. Nevertheless, the university in general does constitute a determining factor.

It may seem less than profound to observe that every teacher education candidate in the department is first a university student, with whatever benefits and limitations accrue. Matters pertaining to student affairs, financial arrangements, class scheduling, record keeping, library facilities, physical plant, and even that intangible "school spirit" are all perquisites of membership in the total university, although directly affecting the circumstances of candidacy in teacher education. The capacity of the university overall very definitely constitutes a point of potential limitation, albeit a difficult one to project.

Restrictions Imposed by Academic Departments and Other Agencies

To date, there have been no restrictions on numbers of teacher education candidates imposed by the academic departments and various supporting agencies of the university. And,

again, it may become convenient to take for granted that the departments offering majors and course work in the disciplines will continue indefinitely to serve teacher education candidates in unlimited numbers. This may be a dangerous attitude, for it is entirely within the realm of possibility that, at any time, the academic departments and supporting agencies may discover that their capacities are finite, and that it has become necessary to impose enrollment limitations.

While there is no particular reason to suspect that such a development is either inevitable or imminent, it does make good sense to realize that continued unlimited service is not guaranteed. Furthermore, since the Department of Education places a high priority on quality teaching majors and excellent course work for teacher education candidates, it may well be that such limits in the academic departments ought even be encouraged by way of insuring such quality.

Restrictions Imposed by the Cooperating School Districts

That the Department of Education is totally at the mercy of the cooperating school districts in the matter of carrying out the clinical aspects of its teacher education programs is a sobering realization. Maintaining a good working relationship with the school districts no doubt constitutes the most fragile aspect of the department's entire

operation--particularly of its preservice programs. Not only do existing arrangements pose numerous complexities in terms of innovation in student teaching and other clinical experiences for preservice candidates, but there is not even assurance that agreements now being honored may be continued indefinitely. The disquieting fact is that the school districts have the prerogative of withdrawing from the relationship altogether; and, should they choose to exercise that prerogative, the department would surely be left high and dry.

To an extent, the arrangements for student teaching and other clinical experiences that obtain between the department and the cooperating school districts are an anachronism. That the understanding has worked as smoothly as it has over the years is probably due more to a not-entirely-forgotten pioneer tradition of mutual cooperation--and perhaps just plain luck--than to any deliberate effort to implement systematic management practices. Certainly, the present agreement is not completely satisfactory from the viewpoint of either party. Important changes are long overdue and ought to be negotiated.

By and large, the school districts have been both gracious and generous in responding to requests for clinical and laboratory opportunities for preservice candidates. In fairness, it must be conceded that the university students

have, to a considerable extent, carried their own weight--benefitting the situation, in many instances, almost commensurately with the help that they have received. Nevertheless, the relationship has, in general, served as a beggar's market for the department. Stipends that have been paid to cooperating teachers who work with student teachers have really been more token than substantive, while district teachers who have volunteered to accept university students in a variety of classroom participation endeavors other than student teaching have been rewarded solely in terms of appreciation.

The Department of Education is convinced that a much more business-like arrangement is basic to any consistency in the quality of its clinical and laboratory operation. Whatever, within reason, may enhance the role and prestige of the cooperating teacher must be done. Also of significance is the notion that school personnel who work directly with the department in various teacher education endeavors be compensated accordingly by the university. In short, standard business practices ought to be followed.

Not only are there areas of long-term dissatisfaction on the part of cooperating teachers and other school personnel, but present arrangements leave much to be desired from the standpoint of the department. The report presents rather definite specifications as to characteristics of quality teacher education, including the clinical and laboratory aspects.

As mentioned earlier, the department holds to a general policy of openness, of being regularly engaged in experimentation, and of constantly looking for alternative approaches. As applied to student teaching and other clinical experiences, this means a great deal of freedom to restructure both curriculum and instructional procedures in the cooperating schools from time to time. In fact, it may call for a level of freedom with which not every classroom teacher may feel comfortable, making it necessary either to curtail the degree of experimental freedom or to secure the services of cooperating teachers who can take such departures from established patterns in stride.

It is important that candidates in teacher education deliberately test the outer limits of their capabilities as prospective teachers. Student teachers and other classroom participants should be encouraged in their individual differences and helped in the development of their own professional goals. Such objectives have implications for the kinds of public school experiences that should be sought.

Teacher education candidates should have opportunity to promote vigorous school-based activity, to enjoy the lively give and take that is possible in a freedom-oriented classroom, and learn to direct educational experiences that are joyful, interesting, and worthwhile. Student teachers and other participants need to find out for themselves that occasional mistakes by learners are an integral part of the

process. To guarantee that each teacher education candidate will be able to incorporate such exploratory activity into his or her clinical experiences places heavy demands for accommodation upon the cooperating school districts.

The department would like to expect a great deal from the clinical aspects of its preservice programs. What is desired for each student teacher or other classroom participant is much more than visitor status; a more direct role in the school situation would be preferred. In fact, the department would favor a policy of complete freedom in the selection of cooperating teachers.

Obviously, such a free-wheeling influence in the cooperating schools is totally out of the question under present arrangements. A matter of more immediate concern is whether the department may successfully put off the day of reckoning, and possibly delay being excluded from the public schools altogether. The restrictions that the cooperating school districts are fully capable of imposing are serious indeed.

Factors that Determine the Overall Capacity of the Department of Education

Limits as to overall capacity of the Department of Education are specified in terms of the numbers of candidates who may be well accommodated in preservice, inservice, and graduate teacher education programs that are focused

upon early childhood, later childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood. In each instance, limits are presumed to be set at levels commensurate with high quality in every respect. In general, capacities within the department are determined by four principal factors: (1) the numbers of qualified faculty persons committed to each program, (2) the standard--or typical--faculty load and the apportionment of responsibilities, (3) the recommended student-faculty ratios with respect to course work, clinical experiences, and advising, and (4) the availability of physical facilities, basic equipment, and necessary supplies. The report relates to each of these factors.

Numbers of Qualified Faculty Persons Committed to Each Program

Uniqueness is prized in the Department of Education. Individuality is encouraged not only in regard to teacher education candidates, but also with respect to faculty members. Highly individualistic professors generally make for an interesting faculty, but the very differences that are valued may thwart any simplistic division of responsibility within a department. With a strongly individualistic faculty, the parts, as it were, are not interchangeable; and it is not feasible merely to assign a proportionate number of members to each of the various programs. Rather, the capacity of a given program will be determined to

a considerable extent by the number of qualified professors whose interests and areas of expertise happen to coincide with the purposes of that particular program. In determining the overall capacity of the department, therefore, it is important that limits be set according to a deliberate matching of faculty commitment with a careful cataloging of expectations for each program. The declared capacity of any such program should not, of course, exceed the number of candidates who may be properly accommodated by available faculty members who are actually committed to that program.

Standard Faculty Load and Apportionment of Responsibilities

An outstanding faculty is an essential ingredient of high quality teacher education. For a department faculty to maintain a significant degree of excellence over an extended period of time requires that individual teaching loads and apportionment of related responsibilities be held to reasonable levels. The achievement of excellence calls for an unstinting investment of professorial time and energy. Decisions as to faculty load, therefore, must protect the integrity of that considerable investment.

The Department of Education is committed to high quality teacher education in both preservice and inservice phases, and it accords highest priority to serving the undergraduate

and graduate students who are registered in its various programs. But, even though effective teaching is readily acknowledged as the most important aspect of the department's overall function, there is a variety of professional challenges--more or less typical of university ferment--that must regularly be undertaken.

If the department is to live up to its own high expectations and prove worthy of the respect and confidence of school people throughout the state in the solving of educational problems, a significant portion of its total effort must necessarily be focused upon the cutting edge of development in teacher education. The declared policy of the department is one of openness, of being regularly engaged in experimentation, and of constantly probing for alternative approaches. Graduate programs must include not only the preparation of master teachers, but also the production of respectable research.

These are but a few examples of the kinds of scholarly and creative endeavors that must be regarded as a normal way of life. Nonetheless, they suffice to underscore the realization that decisions as to faculty load expectations within the department must be made with care and judiciousness. In addition, such considerations point up rather clearly that faculty load standards and apportionment of related responsibilities constitute an actual contingency with respect to the admission and retention of teacher education candidates.

Recommended Student-Faculty Ratios as to Course Work Clinical Experiences, and Advising

Another limiting factor--and possibly of equal cruciality--is the matter of student-faculty ratios in course work offerings, in connection with clinical experiences, and with respect to faculty advising of undergraduate and graduate students.

The Department of Education, as already noted, strives to help candidates find themselves and reach their maximum effectiveness as individuals, to develop positive self-images, to be encouraged in their uniqueness, and to identify and attain their own professional goals. Candidates must have adequate opportunity to relate on a one-to-one basis with faculty members, to work informally as members of small teams and groups, and generally to take an active, questioning, exploratory role in their own professional preparation.

Such individually-oriented teacher education programs impose noticeable demands upon the time and energy of dedicated faculty members. Under such conditions, teaching load expressed simply in terms of separate course preparations constitutes an inadequate assessment of professorial effort. Of nearly equal concern in approaches that are personalized to any extent is the actual number of students who may be registered in a given section of a course. While recommended standards in this respect may vary from course

to course and from professor to professor, it is generally agreed that a constant increase in the number of students registered in a particular course section inevitably alters the nature of interpersonal relationships within the group. At some point, as the number of students continues to enlarge, what had been basically an informal situation takes on the attributes and structure of a formal relationship, with corresponding reductions in the degree of spontaneous participation. What is true in this regard as it pertains to student-faculty ratios in course work offerings is, if anything, even more dramatically substantiated with respect to clinical experiences and advisory relationships.

An important factor in determining overall departmental capacity is that of student-faculty ratios.

Availability of Physical Facilities, Basic Equipment, and Necessary Supplies

To borrow the essence of an historical observation that an army travels on its stomach, it may be observed with equal appreciation that a university department functions according to its stock of paper. In either situation, a fragile supply line surely represents a potential curtailment of operations. The pinch of inadequacies and shortages has already been felt, and it is likely that deficiencies will become even more acute in the very near future.

Physical facilities constitute the most obvious category of possible inadequacies. The opportunity to schedule class sessions, laboratory activities, and necessary conferences for most effective results calls for a ready availability of classrooms, meeting halls, and appropriate work areas at times and in locations of reasonable convenience. Rooms that are either too small or unnecessarily large, or that are not functionally designed may become an ultimate factor in determining class size.

As public education becomes even more inclined to incorporate newer developments in instructional technology into its routine procedures, there is a corresponding requirement that teacher education programs not only be kept abreast, but preferably maintained--at least in some respects--in the vanguard. The department regards training in the proper use of instructional media as an essential facet of quality teacher education. To respond most favorably, candidates should have opportunity, first, to observe their professors making regular use of a variety of media in their own teaching, and, second, to receive direct instruction in the use of helpful resources and items of equipment. Implementing such a commitment obviously necessitates maintaining an adequate inventory of basic equipment.

Supply shortages have been a problem in educational institutions at all levels since the innovation of slates

and dunce caps. It has been occasionally observed--possibly in jest--that helping teacher education candidates to become accustomed to doing without may constitute one of the most realistic aspects of their preservice training, and one that has direct relevance to their subsequent inservice work. Be that as it may, an adequate stock of supplies to keep programs operating smoothly remains a matter for serious consideration.

One further factor, therefore, to be taken into account in assessing departmental capacities as to numbers of candidates in teacher education programs is the constant question of availability of physical facilities, basic equipment, and necessary supplies.

Summary of Guidelines for Specifying Student Capacities in Teacher Education Programs

The foregoing has been a review of one aspect of a report of a self-appraisal study carried out over a four-year period by the Department of Education of the University of Utah. Several facets of the whole matter of determining optimum student capacities in teacher education programs have been considered. I shall summarize briefly.

Conditions and Assumptions

Certain conditions and assumptions constitute a foundational structure upon which to relate each separate factor

that must be taken into account in arriving at decisions as to student capacities.

1. A basic condition of candidacy in all teacher education programs at the University of Utah is that admission and retention are controlled in accordance with established policy.
2. An underlying assumption is that the only legitimate grounds for restricting or limiting the numbers of students in teacher education programs are, first, whether a candidate can satisfy the established minimum requirements for admission to, retention in, and completion of the program in question; and, second, whether each of the various departments and agencies that will be called upon to serve the candidate has the overall capacity to provide quality programs in terms of instruction, guidance, and essential services.
3. A corollary assumption is that arbitrary or externally-imposed quotas (such as, for example, attempts to equate enrollments with projected job-market conditions) constitute an unmitigated violation both of the candidate's inherent right to seek an education and of the fundamental purposes of higher education in an open society.
4. A subsidiary principle with respect to the matter of determining optimum student capacities in the

department is that, when a candidate is admitted to one of the teacher education programs, it is presumed that he or she will qualify for retention and will succeed through to completion of the program, including graduation and certification as a teacher.

Desirable Qualities of Candidates

Since it is largely through its teacher education candidates that the Department of Education hopes ultimately to effect improvements in the quality of teaching in the public schools, the department views admission and retention as matters of great significance. Consistent with this attitude is the conviction that the department ought to recruit actively for the quality of candidates who are deemed to have the greatest potential. Certain personal and intellectual qualities have been specified.

Potentially Restricting or Limiting Conditions Outside of the Department of Education

There are conditions, both inside and outside of the department, that may make it advisable to restrict or limit the numbers of candidates who may be admitted to various teacher education programs. Chief among the conditions that obtain outside of the Department of Education are (1) the overall capacity of the university in general, (2) circumstances within the academic departments and other agencies,

and (3) the capability and willingness of the public schools to cooperate in student teaching and other clinical and laboratory experiences.

Potentially Restricting or Limiting Conditions Within the Department of Education

Factors within the Department of Education that may bear upon decisions to restrict or limit the numbers of candidates in one or more of the programs in teacher education are (1) the numbers of qualified faculty persons committed to each program, (2) the standard--or typical--faculty load and the apportionment of responsibilities, (3) the recommended student-faculty ratios with respect to course work, clinical experiences, and advising, and (4) the availability of physical facilities, basic equipment, and necessary supplies.

I hope that the guidelines for limiting enrollments in teacher education programs that have been identified by the Department of Education of the University of Utah will be of interest to other persons who may be similarly concerned.